

2835
Dec 1859

S P E E C H

Summ

OF

1850 - 1859

MR. LYNN BOYD, OF KENTUCKY,

IN REPLY TO THE HON. JOHN WHITE, RELATIVE TO THE CHARGE OF BARGAIN BETWEEN MESSRS. ADAMS AND CLAY, IN THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION OF 1824-25.

House of Representatives, Tuesday, April 30, 1844, the Bill to regulate the Tariff of Duties on imports being under consideration in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BOYD obtained the floor, and said: My constituents feel a very deep interest in the proper and permanent adjustment of this Tariff question. They are in favor of a Tariff for revenue and opposed to the principle of protection, which they believe to be unwise for the nation, and unequal and unjust to themselves. Sir, my constituents are in the main an agricultural people; they come not here to importune you for exclusive favors of any kind—Whilst the capitalists of the country band together, and as in a common cause, are seen perpetually besieging the Halls of legislation for Banks and Tariffs, and every other conceivable scheme of monopoly, by means of which to swell their overgrown profits, my constituents, in common with their brethren of the producing class throughout the Union, are found at home upon their farms or in their workshops, content to rely upon their own strong arms and the generous bounties of nature for competence, comfort and wealth. Scrupulously abstaining from the invasion of the business and profits of others, by means of partial legislation, they ask in turn to be let alone in the enjoyment of the fruits of their honest industry. Sir, the demand is so just and equitable, that with a due regard to correct principles of legisla-

tion, you cannot, you dare not disregard it.

But, Sir, I did not rise to make a speech on the Tariff. Hoping the bill upon your table may be passed, I must, with the indulgence of the Committee, avail myself of the present occasion to say a few words in reply to my colleague, [Mr. White,] who has thought proper to introduce and build a whole hour's speech upon the subject matter of a letter addressed by me to Messrs. Coles and Hopkins of Va. in reply to certain interrogatories, touching the Presidential election of 1824-5 and Mr. Clay's course in regard to it, and the Bankrupt law of 1841.

Sir, I regret the necessity which compels me to take part in the discussion of matters so foreign to the subject of the bill before us; but I have no alternative left me. It was not I who dragged the subject of the letter alluded to into this discussion; for that, my colleague (Mr. White) is alone responsible.

Before I approach the subject of that letter, I wish to say to my colleague and to the country, that I am among the last upon this floor, or (as I trust) in the world, who would, unjustly or ungenerously, attack the reputation of any man on earth for political purposes; and if in what I have said or shall hereafter say, on this subject, my colleague or any other human being, shall point out any error of fact into which I may have fallen, I will say to him and the country, that there is nothing

in the composition of my nature which would prevent me from making prompt and ample reparation. But, Sir, whilst with pride and pleasure, I would do this, I must be permitted to add, that in relation to this or any other matter of public concernment, whether affecting public men or public measures, there is no power under heaven that shall restrain me from its investigation, with all that freedom and fullness which, in my judgment, its importance demands.

The letter referred to assumes directly or by implication, that between Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay, during the Presidential Canvass of 1824, there were unfriendly relations, which began as far back as the negotiation of the treaty of Ghent in 1814, and continued down to the period when the popular vote was cast between those gentlemen, as opposing candidates for the Presidency in 1824; that Mr. Adams was unpopular in the whole Western Country and especially in Kentucky; that a general belief existed in that State, confirmed if not produced by Mr. Clay himself, that Mr. Adams, as a statesman, was hostile to the interests of that section of the Union; that a direct issue was made between those gentlemen as early as 1822, in reference to that subject, involving "errors both as to matters of fact and matters of opinion;" that the exposition then promised by Mr. Clay, was never made; that prior to the election of President in 1825 by the House of Representatives, the Legislature of Kentucky, in concurrence with the will of the people, requested Mr. Clay and the Kentucky delegation to vote for Gen. Jackson; that some time before the election, it was stated by Mr. Clay's confidential friends in Kentucky, that he would be Secretary of State if Mr. Adams were made President; that in consequence of that information, letters were written to members of Congress to induce them to vote for Mr. Adams; that Mr. Adams was elected President by the votes of Mr. Clay and his friends, and did appoint Mr. Clay Secretary of State; and, finally, that by an investigation in the Senate of Kentucky in 1828, and subsequent disclosures, it was made to appear, that those who stated in Kentucky before the election, that Mr. Clay would be Secretary of State if Mr. Adams were elected President, did so upon the authority of a letter from Mr. Clay himself.

HOSTILITY OF MESSRS. CLAY AND ADAMS.

In proof of the unpopularity of Mr. Adams in the West, prior to 1825, I may rely with confidence on the language then held almost without exception by Western presses and public men. No man old enough to recollect passing events during the ten years preceding 1825, can be ignorant of the fact. Perhaps it was in part owing to his parentage, political education and geographical position; but no small share of it was attributable to impressions created by Mr. Clay himself.

It was charged by Mr. Adams, that Mr. Clay's efforts to injure him commenced at the negotiation of the Treaty of Peace, at Ghent, in 1814. In one of the despatches of the American Commissioners, dated December 25th 1814, will be found the following passage: viz.

"If they, (the British Commissioners,) asked the navigation of the Mississippi as a new claim, they could not expect we should grant it without an equivalent; if they asked it because it was granted in 1783, they must recognise the claim of the people of the United States to the liberty to fish, and to dry and cure fish, in question. To place both points beyond all future controversy, *a majority of us determined to offer to admit an article confirming both rights; or, we offered at the same time to be silent in the treaty upon both; and to leave out, altogether, the article defining the boundary from the Lake of the Woods westward.*"

Mr. Adams in his book upon the Mississippi and fisheries, page 159, shows how the peculiar phraseology came to be employed in that despatch, viz.:

"The draught having been passed round to all the members of the mission for revision, was brought back to me by Mr. Russell, with an alteration, which, he said, was desired, not by him, but by Mr. Clay, to say, instead of "we offered," "a majority of us determined to offer."

On the same day, Mr. Russell wrote a separate letter to the Secretary of State, stating that he should thereafter communicate the views which led the minority to differ with the majority on that question. Accordingly, on the 15th February 1815, while Mr. Clay and himself were together in Paris, he wrote a long letter to Mr. Monroe, then Secretary of State, setting forth the grounds of difference, and animadverting upon the position assumed by the majority. In a publication made in Boston on the 27th June, 1822, Mr. Rus-

sell said, "To the only member of the Mission who had a direct interest in the case, [meaning Mr. Clay,] I did show at the time the letter written at Paris." When it is considered, that the alteration of the joint letter of the Commissioners at Ghent, was not desired by Mr. Russell, but by Mr. Clay, it appears singular that the former should have taken so much pains to explain the grounds of difference between the majority and minority. Be the true reason what it may, there is abundant evidence, that Mr. Adams considered it a joint contrivance of Messrs. Russell and Clay to effect his political ruin.

Mr. Russell's Letter was marked "Private," as if intended to be seen only by Mr. Monroe, who was expected to succeed Mr. Madison as President and might select Mr. Adams as his Secretary of State, thereby placing him in the line of "safe precedents" for the Presidency. It appears to have been mislaid and forgotten. Mr. Monroe was elected President and appointed Mr. Adams Secretary of State. Mr. Clay's friends were not at all pleased with this arrangement. The Kentucky Reporter, Mr. Clay's peculiar organ in Kentucky, then edited by Mr. Smith, who was connected by marriage with his family, on the 14th July, 1818, used the following language: viz.

"Mr. Adams is designated by the President and his presses as the heir apparent, the next successor to the Presidency. Since the principle was introduced, there has been a rapid degeneracy in the Chief Magistrate; and the prospect of still greater degeneracy, is strong and alarming. Admit the people should acquiesce in the Presidential appointment of Mr. Adams to that high office; who again will he choose as his successor? Will it be Josiah Quincy, H. G. Otis, or Rufus King? An aristocrat, at least, if not a TRAITOR, will be our portion."

From all the politicians who were nearly allied to Mr. Clay, were heard expressions exhibiting their dissatisfaction and distrust of Mr. Adams. When in 1819, the Treaty was concluded by Mr. Adams as Secretary of State, which secured Florida to the United States and ceded Texas to Spain, Mr. Clay came out in open opposition. In March 1820, he offered resolutions against the Treaty in the House of Representatives and made a speech against it. He did more. By private letters he created distrust of Mr. Adams' integrity

and patriotism as a negotiator. One of those letters dated 16th April, 1820, addressed to the Editor of the Western Argus, found its way to the public in 1828, and contains the following paragraph: viz.

"There is a rumor in the City which will astonish you, in regard to the conclusion of that treaty. It has been asserted by a member of Congress, as coming from high authority, that, prior to the conclusion of the treaty, it was known to Mr. Adams that we could have obtained more than was conveyed to us; that is, that the Spanish negotiator was allowed by his instructions, to grant us more, but that less was taken, because the Spanish minister declared, if he went up to his instructions, he should be afraid of some personal injury, upon his return home! What will you in the West think of the wisdom of that policy which consents to surrender an important part of our territory from such a motive?"

What followed in the West, Mr. Adams himself describes in his book on the Fisheries and the Mississippi, first page of the Introduction: viz.

"In the course of last summer, (of 1821) I was apprized by a friend, that rumors very unfavorable to my reputation, even for integrity, were industriously circulated in the western country. That it was said I had made a proposition at Ghent to grant to the British the right to navigate the Mississippi, in return for the Newfoundland fisheries, and that this was represented as, at least, a high misdemeanor." "He said, the proposal was to be represented (as an offence) so that it was charged exclusively upon me; and that I should hear more about it ere long."

In January, 1822, the documents relative to the Ghent Negotiation were called for, and in February laid before the House of Representatives. Mr. Adams says, that while these documents were lying on the table, "the correspondence from Washington, and the newspapers indoctrinated by it, had not been equally inactive. Through these channels, the public was assured, that the proposal of offering the navigation of the Mississippi for the fisheries had been made by me; that Mr. Clay had uniformly declared that he would not sign the treaty with such an article in it; and that the proposal had been finally set aside by Mr. Bayard's having changed sides, and come over to the opinion of the minority."

In April 1822, through some mysterious influence never yet explained, Mr. Russell's private letter, written in 1815, was called for by the House of Representatives; but it was said to have been lost or mislaid. Mr. Russell, however, furnished a duplicate, and in June the call was re-

newed. On that occasion, Mr. B. Hardin, a member of the House from Kentucky, is reported to have said, that this letter "would show the western people, in what manner their interests were disregarded or sacrificed; that the Commissioners [at Ghent] offered to give up the navigation of the Mississippi to secure the Fisheries of the East."

Mr. Russell's original letter was now found, and with the duplicate was submitted to Mr. Adams who detected many differences between them which he exposed in a severe commentary. The two papers and the commentary were all sent to the House, and the effect was to discredit Mr. Russell altogether. Mr. Adams followed up the advantage which he had obtained by Mr. Russell's alterations of his letter, repeatedly insinuating as well in his commentary as in subsequent publications, that he considered Mr. Clay at the bottom of the whole scheme. A single extract from his Book on the Fisheries and the Mississippi, page 254, will be sufficient to prove this point: viz.

"The perusal of Mr. Russell's duplicate, disclosed to me the mystery of ruin which had been brewing against me, from the very day after the signature of the treaty of Ghent. It was by representations like those of that letter, that the minds of my fellow-citizens in the west had for a succession of years been abused and ulcerated against me. That letter, indeed, inculcated the whole majority of the mission of Ghent; but subsidiary slander had performed its part of pointing all the guilt and fastening all the responsibility of the crime upon me."

So direct were Mr. Adams' allusions to Mr. Clay as the author of a dishonorable intrigue to destroy him, that the latter was obliged to come before the public. Mr. Adams' book reviewing the controversy, was published about the 1st October 1822. In December of that year, the following letter appeared in the National Intelligencer: viz.

LEXINGTON, 16th Nov. 1822.

"GENTLEMEN: I have witnessed, with very great regret, the unhappy controversy which has arisen between two of my late colleagues at Ghent. In the course of the several publications of which it has been the occasion, and particularly in the appendix to a pamphlet, which has been recently published by the honorable John Quincy Adams, I think there are some errors (no doubt unintentional,) both as to matters of fact and matters of opinion,

in regard to the transactions at Ghent, relating to the navigation of the Mississippi, and certain liberties claimed by the United States in the fisheries, and to the part which I bore in those transactions. These important interests are now well secured, and, as it respects that of the navigation of the Mississippi, left as it ought to be, on the same firm footing with the navigation of all other rivers of the confederacy, the hope may be confidently cherished, that it never will hereafter be deemed a fit subject of negotiation with any foreign power. An account, therefore, of what occurred in the negotiations at Ghent, on these two subjects, is not perhaps necessary to the present or future security of any of the rights of the nation, and is only interesting as appertaining to its past history. With these impressions, and being extremely unwilling to present myself at any time before the public, I had almost resolved to remain silent, and thus expose myself to the inference of an acquiescence in the correctness of all the statements made by both my colleagues; but I have on more reflection, thought, that it may be expected of me, and be considered as a duty on my part, to contribute all in my power towards a full and faithful understanding of the transactions referred to. Under this conviction, I will, at some time more propitious than the present, to calm and dispassionate consideration, and when there can be no misinterpretation of motives, lay before the public a narrative of those transactions as I understood them. I will not, at this time, be even provoked (it would at any time be inexpressibly painful to me, to find it necessary) to enter the field of disputation with either of my late colleagues.

"As to that part of the official correspondence at Ghent, which had not been communicated to the public by the President of the United States, prior to the last session of Congress, I certainly knew of no public considerations, requiring it to be withheld from general inspection. But I had no knowledge of the intention of the honorable Mr. Floyd, to call for it, nor of the call itself, through the House of Representatives, until I saw it announced in the public prints. Nor had I any knowledge of the subsequent call which was made for the letter of the honorable Mr. Russell, or the intention to make it, until I derived it from the same channel.

"I will thank you to publish this note in the National Intelligencer, and to accept assurances of the high respect of your obedient servant,
H. CLAY."

The next day the following reply appeared in the same paper:

To the Editor of the National Intelligencer.

"GENTLEMEN: In your paper of yesterday I have observed a note from Mr. Henry Clay, which requires some notice from me.

"After expressing the regret of the writer at the unhappy controversy which has arisen between two of his late colleagues at Ghent, it proceeds to say, that in the course of the several publications of which it has been the occasion, and particularly in the appendix to the pamphlet recently published by me, 'he thinks there are some errors, (no doubt unintentional,) both as to matters of fact and matters of opinion, in regard to the transactions at Ghent relating to the navigation of the Mississippi and certain liberties claimed by the United States in the fisheries, and to the part which he bore in those transactions.'"

"Concurring with Mr. Clay in the regret that the controversy should ever have arisen, I have only to find consolation in the reflection, that from the seed time of 1814 to the harvest of 1822, the contest was never of my seeking, and that since I have been drawn into it, whatever I have said, written, or done in it, has been in the face of day and under the responsibility of my name.

"Had Mr. Clay thought it advisable, now to specify any error of fact or of imputed opinion which he thinks contained in the appendix to my pamphlet, or in any other part of my share in the publication, it would have given me great pleasure to rectify, by candid acknowledgment, any such error, of which, by the light that he would have shed on the subject, I should have been convinced. At whatever period hereafter, he shall deem the accepted time has come, to publish his promised narrative, I shall, if yet living, be ready with equal cheerfulness, to acknowledge indicated error, and to vindicate contested truth.

"But, as by the adjournment of that publication to a period 'more propitious than the present to calm and dispassionate consideration, and when there can be no misinterpretation of motives,' it may chance to be postponed until both of us shall have been summoned to account for all our errors before a higher tribunal than that of our country, I feel myself now called upon to say, that let the appropriate dispositions, when and how they will, expose the open day and secret night of the transactions at Ghent, the statements both of fact and opinion in the papers which I have written and published, in relation to this controversy, will, in every particular, essential or important to the interests of the nation, or to the character of Mr. Clay, be found to abide unshaken, the test of human scrutiny, of talents, and of time.

"JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

Washington, 18th Dec. 1822."

Mr. Adams here evidently considered Mr. Clay an actor in this attack upon him, "from the seed time of 1814 to the harvest of 1822:" and he seems to have been inspired with a prophetic spirit as to Mr.

Clay's exposition. It is likely to be postponed not only until those gentlemen, but all of us shall be summoned before that higher tribunal. Whether his opinion of Mr. Clay's conduct, was well or ill-founded may be inferred from the following circumstances:

In the summer of 1822, a somewhat elaborate attack on Mr. Adams was prepared by the Editor of the Kentucky Argus, after, as he stated to the public in 1828, a consultation with Mr. Clay at his house in Frankfort. The manuscript was sent to Mr. Clay at Lexington, and by him transmitted to Cincinnati, Ohio, where it was published late in the summer, or early in the fall, in a newspaper called the "Liberty Hall and Cincinnati Gazette," over the signature of "Wayne."

Mr. WHITE desired to know who the writer of "Wayne" was?

Mr. BOYD said, he had always understood him to be Mr. Amos Kendall.

Mr. WHITE. Certainly.

The numbers of "Wayne" were written with the obvious purpose of promoting Mr. Clay's views upon the Presidency, particularly in the State of Ohio. How they speak of Mr. Adams, then considered his only dangerous rival in that State, a few extracts will show. In the third No. are the following passages, viz :

"Ohio presents no candidate for the Presidency at the approaching election."

* * * "At the head of those whose pretensions are entitled to our serious consideration, is John Quincy Adams, the present Secretary of State. Will Ohio choose him?" * * *

"Instead of opening new avenues for our commerce, is it not to be feared that, in some future treaty, to secure some paltry privilege to an Eastern interest, he would render those which already exist, a curse, rather than a blessing? Our frontiers can testify, that we want not those men at the helm of the nation, who would, for any consideration, open new channels for British influence among our northern and western Indians. The horrors of past wars are not forgotten; and you will pause and count the value of many a brave man's life, before you raise to power one whose unfeeling policy would crimson your fresh fields with the blood of your border brethren, and light the midnight forest with the flames of their dwellings. Men who would think of concessions so disastrous, are unworthy the support of Ohio: much more so, are those who reduce them to a serious pro-

position. The navigation of the Mississippi is too important to be bartered for the privilege of fishing in British waters. It is giving our wives and children for fish, and bartering the blood of our citizens for money. Conceal, explain, and sophisticate as he will, this was the tendency of the proposition, which was agitated at Ghent. But was this surprising? Under the same auspices, one of the most fertile and extensive provinces of the West, adequate to the formation of two States, was given to the Spaniards; the State of Louisiana, one of the most important and weakest points in the Union, was made a frontier, and exposed to sudden invasion from the adjoining empire. Is it a matter of deepest concern with us to exterminate the British influence among the northern and western Indians? The blood of slaughtered friends cries aloud to us from the ground, 'It is.' The policy of Mr. Adams introduces the British trader to their wigwam, by opening to him, under the guardianship of a treaty, the navigation of the Mississippi. Shall we sanction this by sustaining him? Is it a matter of the last moment to us to protect our own navigation of the Ohio and Mississippi? Of what value is the Ohio or Mississippi to us, if Louisiana be occupied by an enemy? Yet, Mr. Adams is of the Administration, which, in the traffic of territory, has made Louisiana a frontier. With such principles, John Quincy Adams can never receive the support of Ohio. He is too ignorant of our interests, or he disregards them."

"Wayne," No. 4, contains the following passage, viz.:

"The importance of having a Western man in the National Councils, as well as in all those situations where the interests of this section of the Union are brought in question, was never so strongly exemplified, as in the transactions attending the treaty of Ghent. It was proposed to open the Mississippi, through its whole extent, to the navigation of British subjects, thus giving them the most direct access to those numerous and warlike tribes of Indians which border on our northern and western frontier. That any American statesman should, for a moment, have entertained so fatal a project, is as strange as the fact is alarming. To the presence of an able western man, may we attribute the defeat and abandonment of that atrocious proposal. But for the exertions of Henry Clay, the seeds of war might now have been sowing, along our northern and western borders, which at no distant day, would have produced an abundant harvest of tears and blood. He found that a majority had resolved to make the fatal proposition. With a firmness which should endear him to the people of the West, he protested that he would sign no treaty which con-

tained a stipulation so repugnant to his country's honor, and so dangerous to her peace. This firmness had the desired effect. The illustrious and lamented Bayard changed his mind, and then the West was saved. The danger we thus escaped, should sink deep into our hearts, and teach us a lesson as lasting as our lives."

That these Numbers went through the hands of Mr. Clay before they were published, is proved by his own letter to the author, which appears among the developments of 1828, dated Lexington, 23d June, 1822. In that letter, he says:

"Dear Sir: I received your obliging favor of the 20th instant, and thank you most sincerely for the friendly sentiments towards me which it contains. Mr. T. Crittenden has retained the production which accompanied it, and which he has undertaken to divide and to dispose of in his place of residence [Cincinnati] according to our wishes."

It was, therefore, Mr. Clay himself, more than any other man, who caused these heavy charges against Mr. Adams to be brought before the public. He, more than any other man, knew whether they were just or not, having been the "able western man" who, at Ghent, was alleged to have saved the West from these dire calamities. Did he not believe the charges? I will not stop to inquire whether he did or did not. Others were induced to believe them through his agency, and this was what Mr. Adams called "subsidiary slander," which "had performed its part of pointing all the guilt and fastening all the responsibility upon" him.

"Wayne" was published sometime before Mr. Clay's Letter appeared in the National Intelligencer, in which he expressed so much regret at the controversy which had arisen between two of his colleagues about this affair at Ghent, and declared he would not "be even provoked" at that time "to enter the field of disputation" with either of them. But he did not, after those publications, cease privately to encourage and extend the attacks on Mr. Adams, growing out of that negotiation, and by Mr. Russell's letter brought before the public. In consequence of information received from Mr. Clay as stated by the author of "Wayne," he wrote a series of Letters addressed to Mr. Adams, reviewing his publications in reference to Mr. Russell and Mr. Clay, which were

published in the Frankfort Argus in 1823. The spirit of these letters will be shown by a few extracts. In the 2d Letter are the following passages, viz.:

"Either you have never taken the trouble to inform yourself relative to the great national western interests, which have been committed to your charge, or you have misrepresented and concealed facts, as you knew them to exist. It will be admitted by all, that your acknowledged habits of industry and research, leave little room for you to cover your errors on this point, with the mantle of ignorance."

* * * * *

"It was natural for Mr. Clay to think differently and feel differently from what you pretend to think, and actually felt, in relation to admitting the British to the navigation of the Mississippi. He could not conceal from himself the fact, that the existence and use of this right had been one of the causes which led to the disasters of our arms on the north-western frontiers, and the exposure of all our back settlements to the relentless ravages of a savage foe. He could not forget the consequent murders in Missouri, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio, a catalogue of enormities at which the heart sickens. Remembering all this, he could not but wish—nay, with his ardent and generous nature, he could not but urge, with much earnestness—the policy and justice of excluding the instigators of crimes so horrible, from every avenue of access to their willing instruments. Nor could he but feel differently from you. In consequence of the unlimited access of British emissaries to our Indians through the Mississippi and other channels, more of Kentucky's precious blood was spilt, than could be purchased with every fish that swims in British waters. Many dear friends, and one near connexion of Mr. Clay, had fallen victims to the Indian tomahawk, made on British anvils. When he departed for Europe, he left a social circle, and even a family, clothed in mourning for these victims of British influence over savage minds. Passing from the midst of the mourners and the maimed, how could he feel as you did, who, far distant from your bleeding country, engrossed with the events of another hemisphere, and admiring 'the Titus of his age,' scarcely heard the thunder of war rolling over the heads of your countrymen, below the western horizon. It was surely natural that he and you should feel differently. You ought therefore, to have excused Mr. Clay's zeal, against once more admitting the British traders among our Indians, and hazarding a renewal of the bloody scenes of the Pigeon roost, the River Raisin, and fort Meigs. He could not calculate so coolly as you. If, in the excitement caused by recent Anglo-Indian murders,

he preferred the lives of his fellow citizens to all the fish which might, perchance, be caught within three miles of the British coast, you ought to have considered, that his mind was not in a condition coolly to weigh dollars against blood; and surely you would rather have excused him as a generous enthusiast, than censured him for compromising the interests of his country."

The 4th Letter contains the following passage, viz.:

"By facts, by the rights of your country, and by your own assertions, we have proved, that at the time of the negotiation at Ghent, the British Government possessed no territory on the Mississippi, and that, consequently, that river was within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States. In supporting and voting for Mr. Gallatin's proposition, you therefore committed a violation of the very letter of your instructions; and your declarations at the time, as well as subsequently, to the British Government, prove that you did it knowingly."

The 7th Letter contains the following passage, viz.:

"It was not without astonishment, that we discovered how presumptuously, in the short space of eight pages, you have sported with your own character for consistency, and with the credulity of your countrymen. That one who writes with almost unexampled rapidity, should forget in page 104 what he had said in page 100, is hardly credible; but that any man who has the least regard for his own reputation, should, with his memory and his senses fresh about him, have the hardihood wilfully to involve himself in the grossest contradictions, staggers all human belief. We rather suppose that with a vivid fancy and powerful intellect, you invent as you pass along, premises and arguments to suit a predetermined conclusion, on which you strike as certainly, and with a course as crooked, as the lightning falls upon its destined object."

The 8th Letter contains the following, viz.:

"We have pointed out many of your inconsistencies and contradictions, both in argument and language; have exhibited your concealments and perversions of known facts; have shown you vainly endeavoring to shelter yourself from censure by testing the meaning of your instructions by the claims of our enemy, making the boundaries and territory of your country, as well as our right to navigate the Mississippi, a conditional grant, the condition of which we have expressly refused to fulfil, arguing against the rights of independent nations in favor of British monopoly, and jeopardizing our rights to the whole fisheries,

ly making them dependant on a contested principle.

"In fine, we have shown that your boasted publications relative to the Ghent mission, are full of absurdities, inconsistencies, and contradictions; and that the injustice of your denunciations against your colleagues of the minority, can only be equalled by the eloquence and boldness with which they are uttered."

"By the past, by the present, by the conduct of our own Government, and by your own conduct, we have shown that the navigation of the Mississippi was, and would have continued to be, useful to British subjects, and fraught with innumerable dangers to the citizens of the United States. We hold you as the author, at least in mind, of all the evils which would have flowed from this disastrous concession; and in rendering you that justice which you demand, from the inhabitants of the West, we shall show you, by our voice and our vote, that we consider your course at Ghent, and still more your vindication in 1822, as full proof that your views are too narrow, your feelings too sectional, and your temper too vindictive, for the Chief Magistrate of a free people."

In the 9th Letter the author undertakes to prove Mr. Adams' hostility to the West by a variety of other acts. The following is an extract, viz.:

"The purchase of Louisiana was the first great incident, which gave vent, in public acts, to your hostile feelings towards the western country. Elected by the Federal party in Massachusetts, who openly avowed opposition to the extension of our national limits, you then held a seat in the Senate of the United States. It would have been unnatural, had you not participated in the feelings of a party of which you were a leader and a favorite. Accordingly, we find you, as a Senator, voting against a bill enabling the President to take possession of Louisiana; against extending the laws of the United States to the territory; against dividing it into two territories, for the greater convenience both of the Government and the people; against the power of Congress to tax it, for purposes of Government; and even against opening pest roads to New Orleans, through the Indian country, within our former territories!"

These are but specimens of the eloquence and power with which Mr. Adams was denounced in these letters. Although they were certainly not Mr. Clay's productions, they probably derived a portion of their force from his suggestions, and certainly his money and influence gave them cir-

culatation. As testified before the Senate of Kentucky, he offered the author fifty dollars to aid him in printing a pamphlet edition, and afterwards paid one hundred for that object to another printer. These facts were proved before the Senate of Kentucky in January, 1828:

"WILLIAM TANNER was called and sworn. A pamphlet was shown to him, entitled "Letters to John Quincy Adams, relative to the Fisheries and the Mississippi, first published in the Argus of Western America, revised and enlarged, by Amos Kendall," and he was asked whether he printed it. He replied that he did. He was asked whether Mr. Clay paid any part of the expense. He replied that he did pay \$100; that he, Tanner, undertook to print the pamphlet by subscription; that Mr. Kendall told him Mr. Clay had proposed to him to print it and offered to pay part of the expenses; that he had taken a letter from Mr. Kendall to Mr. Clay; that Mr. Clay conversed with him as to the expense of printing the pamphlet, and the subscription for it; that he told him to go to Mr. Thomas Smith, who would hand him \$75, and that if he should not be remunerated by the subscriptions, to call on him and he would pay him the balance of the expense; that he called on Mr. Smith who paid him the money; that the subscriptions falling short, he again called on Mr. Clay, who sent him to Mr. Smith for \$25 more. The pamphlet was printed in the latter part of 1823."

Mr. WHITE (Mr. B. yielding the floor) remarked that Mr. Tanner was now a thorough-going Democrat, and an editor of one of the most full-blooded Democratic papers in that State.

Mr. BOYD said that was true, but he had never known of his testimony having been contradicted then or since.

Mr. Clay's direct agency in giving the pamphlet circulation was proved in 1828, by the publication of a Letter from him to the author, of which the following is an extract, viz.:

"DEAR SIR: Several inquiries have been made about your pamphlet on the Fisheries by members of Congress, and I have promised to request a copy to be sent to Mr. David Sloane, of the Ohio Senate, at Columbus; another to the Hon. Henry R. Storrs, and another to the Hon. John Sloane, here. Will you be good enough to have them forwarded?"

These facts show the hostility existing between Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay. They show that Mr. Clay was himself active in destroying Mr. Adams' character and popularity in the West; not only as a politi-

cian, but as a truthful, honest, and patriotic man; and that Mr. Adams knew it. They show that, well understanding each other, Mr. Clay was under a promise to expose Mr. Adams' conduct at Ghent, and that Mr. Adams held him at defiance. This was their personal attitude towards each other when the popular vote was given for President in 1824.

THE CABINET SUCCESSION.

But there was a general principle on which Mr. Clay and his friends were opposed to Mr. Adams, totally incompatible with giving him their support in that election. It grew out of the position Mr. Adams held as a member of Mr. Monroe's Cabinet. So quietly had the Secretary of State succeeded to the Presidency in the cases of Mr. Madison and Mr. Monroe, that many Republicans began to be alarmed at the idea that this might become the regular order of succession, and that each President would virtually appoint his successor, the whole power and patronage of the Administration being steadily devoted to the object of making the head of the Cabinet the next President.

We have seen that, as early as July, 1818, the Reporter, Mr. Clay's organ at Lexington, said, "Mr. Adams is designated by the President and his presses as the heir apparent—the next successor to the Presidency. Since the principle was introduced there has been a rapid degeneracy in the Chief Magistrate; and the prospect of still greater degeneracy is strong and alarming," &c.

The Presidential campaign of 1824 may be said to have been opened by Mr. Clay's friends in 1821 or 1822. In the first part of the latter year, a series of essays ascribed, I know not how justly, to Mr. Clay's own pen, appeared in the Frankfort Argus, advocating his pretensions. In his introductory number the writer held the following language, viz.:

"The National Intelligencer is not, precisely, the most fitting paper to issue this edict commanding silence. It might, indeed, suit the taste of their official patrons and employers, that as little as possible should be published on this subject. They may prefer, that the prescribed line of legitimacy, according to which the heir apparent should be translated from the Department of State to the Palace, be preserved unbroken and entire. But they ought to remember the practice of Rome, by which the Cæsars themselves, to

secure that tranquillity which the Editors of the Intelligencer so much desire, provided beforehand for the imperial succession, has not yet been engrafted on our Constitution."

In July, 1824, the friends of Mr. Clay in Ohio, published an Address signed by the Hon. Joseph Vance, as chairman, in which they set forth the grounds on which they supported, and intended to adhere to him. Their "first object" in bringing him forward, as stated by themselves, was as follows: viz.

"The considerations here briefly hinted, determined many of the most reflecting citizens of the country to adopt the opinion, that no member of the present executive cabinet ought to be selected to succeed Mr. Monroe; and this determination was formed without any disrespect to the talents or character of the incumbents themselves. It rested upon public principle and upon public duty, and upon these alone. In looking around for some person out of the cabinet, and unconnected with the executive administration of the national government, a large portion of the citizens of the West, naturally directed their attention to Henry Clay of Kentucky."

"Were Mr. Clay withdrawn, the result, as to the election by the electors, would most probably be the same; or if it were not, it *would place in the Presidential chair one of the present cabinet*; an event which it was the *first object of the friends of Mr. Clay to prevent*; not in reference to the men, but the principle. Mr. Clay was nominated in the persuasion that all his fellow-citizens, entertaining the same general views, would unite in his support. Had this been the case; had this union taken place, his election by the electors, would have been certain. It is the clear conviction of his supporters, that *the object of nominating him*, can only be attained by adhering to him, that to abandon him, is to abandon *that object*; and under this conviction, they have adopted the resolution to adhere to him, as the dictate of duty and of patriotism."

It may be affirmed without hesitation, that among Mr. Clay's friends generally, a principal object in supporting him, if not, as in Ohio, the very "first," was to put an end to the Cabinet succession. To that principle Mr. Clay was pledged, as far as any candidate could be, in his implied, if not express, assent to the political creed laid down by his friends as the basis on which he was supported.

PREPARES "TO CONTROL THE EVENT."

From Gen. Jackson's popularity in the

Western country, it became evident early in the year 1824, that he would carry off a large portion of the votes on which Mr. Clay had relied with great confidence, rendering it doubtful whether he would reach the House of Representatives as one of the three highest candidates. In one of his Letters to the Editor of the *Western Argus*, published in 1828, Mr. Clay, under date of February 16, 1823, said:

"Judging from present appearances, the contest will be between Mr. Adams and me."

In another Letter, dated March 18, 1824, he used the following language, viz.:

"New York continues to be a contested State. My decided opinion is that it will give its support to Mr. Adams or to me, or perhaps divide it between us; in that case Mr. Crawford cannot come into the House. My friends are confident in the belief, that if I enter the House as one of the three highest, no matter with what associates, I shall be elected. If, contrary to all probability, Mr. Crawford should obtain the vote of New York, the contest for an entry into the House, will probably be between Jackson and me. In Maryland, Delaware, and New Jersey, I have reasons to count upon some support. Without entering into further particulars, my opinion is, that my friends have every motive for vigorous, animated, and persevering exertion."

This shows that, instead of a contest between Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay, for an election by the electors, it had now become, in the estimation of Mr. Clay, a struggle between him and Mr. Crawford or Gen. Jackson, for entry into the House.

In May, 1824, two months after the date of Mr. Clay's Letter to the Editor of the *Argus*, his friends at Washington city issued an Address, from which the following is an extract, viz.:

"If, contrary to all probability, Mr. Clay should not be returned to the House, his friends, having done their duty, will be able, *by concentration, to control the event*. They will hold in their hands the balance. They will determine between the opposing and conflicting interests and secure to the country a *Republican Administration*."

"Under all the views taken, it is determined to recommend to his friends to adhere to him steadily and to await the issue now depending before the people."

The authorship of this Address was ascribed to Mr. Clay himself. That it spoke

his sentiments cannot be doubted, when it is recollected that he was then in Washington, where it was issued, presiding over the House of Representatives as Speaker. A design, "*by concentration to control the event*," in the contingency of his not being returned to the House of Representatives, is here avowed as the policy of Mr. Clay's friends.

On the 15th of July following, the friends of Mr. Clay in Ohio issued an Address to prevent defection from his support, in consequence of the growing strength of Gen. Jackson, extracts from which I have already submitted.

In September, the Clay Committee in Kentucky issued an Address, expressing the opinion that there could be no election by the electors; that the election must devolve on the House of Representatives; and that no single candidate could in that body outnumber the vote of Mr. Clay. They then make the following declaration, viz.:

"In fine, Mr. Clay considers himself wholly in the hands of the people; and we as his friends and supporters, believing him worthy of our continued exertions, and that his prospects of success are still unclouded and brightening, avow our determination, and we believe we speak the language of all his friends, to abide by our preference to the last. If he should be returned to the House of Representatives, we have little doubt of his final election, with the approbation and applause of the majority of the nation; but if any untoward circumstance should prevent his being one of the three highest, his friends in Congress, by throwing their weight into the scale of the most *Republican and National* candidate, will have it in their power to defeat the ends of political management, and see that the Republic sustains no injury."

The course indicated in the Washington, Ohio, and Kentucky Addresses of 1824, was followed up by Mr. Clay in person. In October he met several of the Kentucky members of Congress in Frankfort. One of them, the Hon. T. P. Moore, made the following statement in a Letter to Gen. John P. Van Ness, dated March 4, 1828, viz.:

"In that month, Mr. Clay, Mr. Trimble, Mr. C. A. Wickliffe, myself, and perhaps other members of the Kentucky delegation, casually met at Frankfort during the session of the Court of Appeals. There Mr. Clay, for the first time, expressed to me an apprehension that he should be excluded from the House

of Representatives; and observed, with seeming carelessness of manner, that it would be best for us, in that case, to remain uncommitted as to our second choice."

Another of them, the Hon. C. A. Wickliffe, now Postmaster General, in a Letter to Gen. Van Ness, dated March 14, 1828, made the following statement, viz.:

"We entered pretty much at large upon the subject. My inquiries were more particularly directed to his prospects of getting a portion of the votes of the State of New York, having formed the opinion that unless Mr. Clay could receive a portion of the votes of that State, he would not be returned as one of the three highest candidates. Mr. Clay replied, that his friends in that State had it in contemplation, if it were practicable, to unite with the friends of Mr. Crawford, and divide the votes between himself and Mr. Crawford. Of the success of this project he spoke doubtfully, and remarked that he did not place much reliance upon the result. In the event it should fail, it is more than probable, said he, I may be excluded from the House of Representatives. To meet such a contingency my friends must be prepared, and I think it best that they should not hastily commit themselves in their second choice."

The Legislature of Kentucky met on the 1st November, 1824, bearing with them the almost unanimous feeling of the People in favor of Gen. Jackson as their second choice, in the event that Mr. Clay could not be elected. It was apprehended that the Legislature might interfere, if Mr. Clay should be excluded from the House, and instruct their delegation in Congress to vote for Gen. Jackson. That result Mr. Clay himself personally interposed to prevent. In February, 1828, the following declaration was made in the Senate of Kentucky, by a gentleman who has ever stood high in public estimation, viz.:

"THOMAS D. CARNEAL, a Senator, at the request of Mr. Pope, stated, that he had a conversation with Mr. Clay at his room, a few days before he started for Washington City, in the fall of 1824. Mr. Clay said he did not like to be instructed by the Legislature as to his vote, should he not be returned to the House as one of the three highest, which he thought doubtful, but wished to be left entirely free. Mr. Carneal told him he had intended to introduce resolutions of instruction into the Senate himself, requesting the Kentucky delegation to vote for General Jackson, but promised on account of the objection of Mr. Clay, not to do it although he said he must vote for

them should they be introduced by others. Mr. Clay said, in case he were excluded from the House, he was wholly uncommitted as to his vote, and wished to be left free."

Mr. Clay himself published a Letter to him from Col. James Davidson, another member of the Senate in 1824, in which Davidson said, that in consequence of information from Mr. Clay himself, he told the Senate, while subsequently discussing the resolutions of instruction, that "*all the resolutions we could pass during the whole session, would not induce you [Mr. Clay] to abandon what you conceived, to be your duty, and that I knew you could not concur with a majority of the Legislature on that subject.*" This information Col. Davidson stated he had communicated to others, among whom were some members of the Legislature, who afterwards opposed the resolutions.

Such were Mr. Clay's arrangements "to control the event," when the result of the election in 1824 was announced. Of the electors then chosen, there were—

For Gen. Jackson,	99
" Mr. Adams,	84
" Mr. Crawford,	41
" Mr. Clay,	37

As the Constitution confines the choice of President, by the House of Representatives, to the three highest candidates, Mr. Clay was excluded from the competition.

Of the popular votes given in the eight Western States—Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi—Gen. Jackson received 68,067, Mr. Clay 43,867, Mr. Adams 21,555, and Mr. Crawford 2,330; by which it appears that Gen. Jackson received in those States 46,512 votes more than Mr. Adams, 24,201 more than Mr. Clay, and 315 more than Adams, Clay, and Crawford, all combined.

In the whole Union the popular votes were:

For Gen. Jackson,	152,951
" Mr. Adams,	105,322
" Mr. Crawford,	47,305
" Mr. Clay,	46,668

It hence appears, that Gen. Jackson had a majority of 961 over Messrs. Adams and Clay combined.

Mr. WHITE inquired of the gentleman what authority he was reading from?

Mr. BOYD said, I am reading from the United States Telegraph of 1828, and

quoting from the Address of the Jackson Committee, and other documents therein recorded. No man shall grope in the dark after me.

How was the popular vote in Kentucky at the electoral election of 1824? For Mr. Clay 17,331; for Gen. Jackson 6,455. How many votes did Mr. Adams receive in that State? *Not one.* I thought the other day, that Mr. Adams might have received a few hundred votes in the State; but on recurrence to the National Intelligencer, as well as the Telegraph, giving the returns, I do not find *one* put down in his favor.

"To control the event" was now all Mr. Clay could do, and that policy he seems to have steadily pursued. The effort to prevent the Kentucky members from committing themselves as to their second choice, commenced by Mr. Clay at Frankfort in October, was continued in Washington after his arrival here. Major Moore, in his Letter already quoted from, makes the following statement, viz.:

"After my arrival in the city, I was confined to my room by indisposition. While in this situation, Mr. Clay called, and after the usual civilities, told me, in emphatic terms, that he had little doubt he was excluded from the House of Representatives, and that all "we" (meaning the Kentucky delegation in Congress) "had now to do, was to hold ourselves uncommitted, as to our second choice," declaring, "that we could vote for either of the three candidates, and justify ourselves to our constituents."

Major Moore says that the Hon. R. P. Henry, in 1824 one of the Kentucky members, but deceased prior to 1828, "detailed a similar conversation, which had taken place between himself and Mr. Clay."

KENTUCKY INSTRUCTIONS.

In the month of December considerable sensation was produced in Kentucky by rumors from Washington, that the vote of the State might be given to Mr. Adams, with some view to Mr. Clay's aggrandizement. In this state of things, Mr. Henry Crittenden offered in the Kentucky House of Representatives two resolutions, requesting our members of Congress to vote for Gen. Jackson, and declaring him to be the second choice of that State. A brief sketch of the debate on these resolutions, on the 31st day of December, 1824, which was published at the time, clearly shows

under what impressions the subject was discussed.

Mr. George Robertson (whom Col. Davidson had told, on the authority of Mr. Clay himself, that he would not regard any such instructions) moved to lay them on the table. Among the reasons given by him were, "that it would be indelicate to Mr. Clay; that it would lessen the weight of Kentucky in the next Administration; that it was better to leave our members of Congress to act according to contingencies; that the weight and importance of the State, and the Western country, could, in that manner, be best secured." "That the resolutions would not only degrade our respected fellow-citizen, [evidently meaning Mr. Clay,] but throw Kentucky upon the electioneering arena in Congress completely handcuffed," &c.

"Mr. Shepherd had always been in favor of Gen. Jackson. Some of the friends of Mr. Clay, he had no doubt, wished to defeat the resolution, and leave that gentleman to make the best bargain he could. But he did not wish the vote of Kentucky to be bartered away; or that Mr. Clay should be Secretary of State, to the exclusion of Jackson as President."

"Mr. B. Hardin said he *knew* that many of our members of Congress were inclined to vote for Mr. Adams, and he believed he would get the vote of Kentucky, unless this House acted. He recapitulated the strength of Adams and Jackson, and believed the result of the Presidential election depended on the vote of Kentucky, and probably on the vote of this House on this day."

The resolutions were adopted by an overwhelming majority in the following form, viz.:

"Whereas it appears from the result of the elections in the several States, and the formation of the electoral colleges for choosing a President of the United States, that no person will receive a majority of the electoral votes, and that Henry Clay, who was the first choice of the people of Kentucky, has not received a sufficient number of votes to bring him before the House of Representatives as one of the three highest from whom the choice of the President of the United States is to be made—therefore,

"*Resolved, &c.* That the members of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, from this State, be requested to vote for General Andrew Jackson as President of the United States.

"*Resolved, as the opinion of this Legislature,* That General Andrew Jackson is the second choice of the State of Kentucky for the next President of the United States; that a very large majority of the people of this State prefer General Jackson to Mr. Adams or Mr. Crawford; and that the members of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States will, by complying with the request herein signified, faithfully

and truly represent the feelings and wishes of the good people of Kentucky."

MR. CLAY AND GEN. JACKSON.

While Mr. Clay and Mr. Adams stood before the public at open defiance with each other, we have evidence that the former was on friendly if not intimate terms with Gen. Jackson. The following statements were made on oath before the Senate of Kentucky, viz.:

"*Oliver Keene* stated, that in the fall of 1824, eight or ten days before Mr. Clay started for Washington city, he asked Mr. Clay, in conversation, whether he had written to Gen. Jackson to come to his house and go on to Washington with him? Mr. Clay said he had.

"*Francis McAllear* stated, that on the morning Mr. Clay started for Washington, in the fall of 1824, in the presence of several gentlemen he heard Mr. Clay say he had written to Gen. Jackson to come through Lexington and go on to Washington with him, but had received no answer, and had given him out."

Gen. R. K. Call, in a Letter to General Van Ness, dated Feb. 4, 1828, gives an account of the first meeting of Mr. Clay and Gen. Jackson after the electoral election in 1824, in the following words, viz.:

"As Gen. Jackson, Major Eaton, and myself, were returning from the Capitol, after passing through the Rotundo we were overtaken by Mr. Clay, who approached Gen. Jackson with his usual pleasing address, and with the following familiar and friendly language: 'Gen. Jackson, I have a quarrel with you: why did you not let me know you were coming by Lexington? I certainly should have waited for your arrival.' And to the best of my recollection he added, 'We should have travelled together.'"

In addition to this testimony, we have the admission of Mr. Clay himself, that friendly relations had been re-established between him and Gen. Jackson prior to the election of 1824. In one of his addresses to the public, in vindication of his vote for Mr. Adams, he speaks as follows, viz.:

"Such was the state of our relations at the commencement of the session of Congress in 1823, the interval having passed without my seeing him. Soon after his arrival here to attend that session, I collected from certain indications that he had resolved upon a general amnesty, the benefit of which was to be extended to me. He became suddenly reconciled with some individuals between whom and himself there had been a long existing enmity. The greater part of the Tennessee delegation, (all, I believe, except Mr. Eaton and Gen. Cocke,) called on me together early in the session, for the express purpose, as I understood, of producing a reconciliation between us." * * * "I stated that the opinions I had expressed in the House of Representatives in regard to General Jackson's

military transactions, had been sincerely entertained, and were still held; but that, being opinions in respect to public acts, they never had been supposed by me to form any just occasion for private enmity between us, and that none had been cherished on my part. Consequently, there was no obstacle on my side to a meeting with him, and maintaining a respectful intercourse."

Mr. Clay further says, he afterwards dined with General Jackson, and the General with him, and continued to exchange expressions of civility and respect.

THE EVENT.

There were seemingly many reasons, as well of a private as of a public nature, why Mr. Clay should not vote for Mr. Adams, and should vote for Gen. Jackson.

Mr. Clay had been instrumental in inducing the people of the West to believe that Mr. Adams was an unsound statesman, peculiarly hostile to their interests, and an unscrupulous man.

Mr. Adams had denounced Mr. Clay as engaged in a long-continued intrigue to destroy him, pursuing his object by covert and dishonorable means.

Mr. Clay stood publicly pledged to expose Mr. Adams' errors, both of fact and opinion, and Mr. Adams had hurled at him an indignant defiance.

Mr. Clay's personal relations with Gen. Jackson were those of friendly intercourse.

Of Gen. Jackson's devotion to the interests of the West there could be no shadow of doubt.

He had received more electoral votes than any other candidate.

He had received a large plurality of the popular votes.

He was the only candidate, except Mr. Clay, who had received any votes in Kentucky.

He was, without question, the second choice of a vast majority of the American People.

Mr. Adams was, and Gen. Jackson was not, a member of the Cabinet.

Mr. Clay and his colleagues were requested by an overwhelming majority of the Kentucky Legislature to vote for Gen. Jackson as the undoubted second choice of the people of that State.

Nevertheless, Mr. Clay voted for Mr. Adams, and gave him the vote of Kentucky.

He carried with him the votes of Ohio, where Mr. Adams received but 12,280 popular votes out of 50,000, of Illinois,

where he received but 1,542 out of 4,700, and of Missouri, where he received but 311 votes out of 2,700.

Under these circumstances, it was but natural that the people of the entire West, and particularly of Kentucky, should have been shocked and astounded on learning that the vote of that State had been cast for Mr. Adams, and especially, as it was followed by that other remarkable circumstance of the offer by Mr. Adams and the acceptance by Mr. Clay of the office of Secretary of State. They felt mortified and indignant at the manner in which their feelings and their will had been trampled under foot and their dearest interests betrayed into the hands of him whom they had been taught to regard as their worst enemy; and they awaited the return of their Representatives to call them to a strict account.

THE MOTIVE.

A few days prior to the election, rumors of an attempt of the friends of Mr. Adams to buy the Presidency, by offering the office of Secretary of State to Mr. Clay, were rife at Washington. These rumors were brought before the public by a Letter from Washington to the Editor of the *Columbian Observer*, a newspaper then printed in Philadelphia. That Letter was as follows, viz.:

"WASHINGTON, Jan. 25, 1825.

"*Dear Sir:* I take up my pen to inform you of one of the most disgraceful transactions that ever covered with infamy the Republican ranks. Would you believe that men professing *Democracy* could be found base enough to lay the axe at the root of the tree of Liberty? Yet, strange as it is, it is not less true. To give you a full history of this transaction would far exceed the limits of a letter. I shall, therefore, at once proceed to give you a brief account of such a bargain as can only be equalled by the famous Burr conspiracy of 1801. For some time past the friends of Clay have hinted that they, like the Swiss, would fight for those who would pay best. *Overtures were said to have been made by the friends of Adams to the friends of Clay, offering him the appointment of Secretary of State for his aid to elect Adams.* And the friends of Clay gave this information to the friends of Jackson, and hinted, that if the friends of Jackson would offer the same price they would close with them. But none of the friends of Jackson would descend to such *barter and sale*. It was not believed by any of the friends of Jackson that this contract would be ratified by the members from the States who had voted for Mr. Clay. I was of opinion, when I first heard of this transaction, that men professing any honorable principle could not, and would not, be transferred, like the planter does his negroes, or the farmer

his team and horses. No alarm was excited; we believed the Republic was safe. The nation having delivered Jackson into the hands of Congress, backed by a large majority of their votes, there was, on my mind, no doubt that Congress would respond to the will of the nation, by electing the individual they had declared to be their choice. *Contrary to this expectation, it is now ascertained to a certainty, that Henry Clay has transferred his interest to John Quincy Adams.* As a consideration of this abandonment of duty to his constituents, it is said and believed, should this unhappy coalition prevail, *Clay is to be appointed Secretary of State.* I have no fears on my mind; I am clearly of opinion we shall defeat every combination. The force of public opinion must prevail, or there is an end to LIBERTY."

To this Letter Mr. Clay responded as follows:

"A CARD.

"I have seen, without any other emotion than that of ineffable contempt, the abuse which has been poured out upon me by a scurrilous paper printed in this city, and by other kindred prints and persons, in regard to the Presidential election. The Editor of one of those prints, ushered forth in Philadelphia, called the *Columbian Observer*, for which I do not subscribe, and which I have not ordered, has had the impudence to transmit to me his vile paper of the 28th inst. In that number is inserted a letter, purporting to have been written in this city, on the 25th instant, by a member of the House of Representatives belonging to the Pennsylvania delegation. I believe it to be a forgery; but if it be genuine, I pronounce the member, whoever he may be, a base and infamous calumniator—a *dastard and a liar*; and if he dare unveil himself, and avow his name, I WILL HOLD HIM RESPONSIBLE, as I here admit myself to be, TO ALL THE LAWS WHICH GOVERN AND REGULATE MEN OF HONOR.

"H. CLAY.

"31st January, 1825."

Three days thereafter Mr. Kremer made public the following reply:

"ANOTHER CARD.

"George Kremer, of the House of Representatives, tenders his respects to the Honorable 'H. Clay,' and informs him, that, by reference to the Editor of the *Columbian Observer*, he may ascertain the name of the writer of a letter of the 25th ultimo, which, it seems, has afforded so much concern to 'H. Clay.' *In the mean time, George Kremer holds himself ready to prove, to the satisfaction of unprejudiced minds, enough to satisfy them of the accuracy of the statements which are contained in that letter, to the extent that they concern the course and conduct of 'H. Clay.'* Being a Representative of the People, he will not fear to 'cry aloud and spare not,' when their rights and privileges are at stake.

"GEORGE KREMER

"February 3, 1825."

Mr. Clay then shifted his ground, and demanded an investigation by the House of Representatives, of which he was Speaker. As the House itself was composed in a great measure of the instru-

ments by which this bargain, if any existed, was to be consummated, Mr. Kremer did not consider it the proper tribunal to make such an investigation, and refused to meet Mr. Clay's issue before that body. Besides, Mr. Adams was not yet elected, nor was Mr. Clay Secretary of State; and however well satisfied men might be that such an arrangement had been agreed upon, or become tacitly understood, it was not easy to prove men's intentions, when no overt act had been committed.

What was then rumor became fact, however, upon the organization of the Administration. Many thought they saw in that arrangement both the cause and the effect of Mr. Adams' election, and the confirmation of Mr. Kremer's charge.

When the Kentucky members returned home, their constituents demanded to know why they had voted for Mr. Adams against Gen. Jackson, in violation of the public will? I will now show what was their answer.

HON. FRANCIS JOHNSON'S EXCUSE.

The following testimony was given under oath before the Senate of Kentucky, viz.:

"*James McMillan*, of the House of Representatives, stated in reply to interrogatories, that Mr. Francis Johnson was at Tompkinsville, in Monroe county, after his return home subsequent to the Presidential election, where he was asked how he came to vote for Mr. Adams? Mr. Johnson answered, that he voted for Mr. Adams to get Mr. Clay made Secretary of State. He made this declaration repeatedly in conversation, and witness believed in a public speech. He said that Mr. Adams for President, and Mr. Clay his Secretary, would conduce more to the interests of the West than General Jackson President, with we know not whom for his Secretary, and that Mr. Clay might, perhaps, succeed him."

The following confirmation of Mr. McMillan's testimony was furnished soon afterwards, viz.:

"We, whose names are undersigned, do hereby certify that, some time subsequent to the last Presidential election, we heard Francis Johnson, Esq. in the town of Tompkinsville, Monroe county, give as a reason for voting for John Quincy Adams, that if Mr. Adams was elected President Mr. Clay would be Secretary of State; but that if Gen. Jackson was elected President Mr. Clay would not be Secretary; and that he believed, Mr. Adams for President, with Mr. Clay for Secretary, would conduce more to the interest of the West than General Jackson for President, with we know not whom for Secretary. We do not pretend to give Mr. Johnson's precise words; but

we say positively, that the above is true in substance, and we know we are not mistaken.

WILLIAM HOWARD,
ISAAC JACKSON,
JOSHUA RUSH,
BENJAMIN RUSH,
HOWARD MERCER,
LEWIS FRANKLIN."

HON. DAVID TRIMBLE'S EXCUSE.

Before the Senate of Kentucky, *Mr. Secrest*, a member of the House of Representatives, made the following statement in his testimony, viz.:

"After his return from Congress in 1825, he heard Mr. Trimble give as an apology for voting for Adams, that if Mr. Adams had not been elected Mr. Clay would not have been Secretary of State; and that if Gen. Jackson had been elected Mr. Adams would have been Secretary."

John Mason, jr., on the same occasion, testified as follows, viz.:

"When witness heard that Trimble had voted for Adams he was surprised; and soon after his return he had a conversation with him about his vote, in which he gave as his reasons, that we ascertained if Mr. Adams was made President Mr. Clay would be made Secretary of State; and that if Gen. Jackson was made President, Mr. Clay would not be made Secretary; and that it would be better for us to have Adams, with Mr. Clay Secretary, than Gen. Jackson, without him."

Micajah Harrison, in a Letter to the Editor of the *Argus*, dated 7th Feb. 1828, states as follows, viz.:

"Without entering into all the minutiae of conversation which took place, I will state that the Hon. David Trimble observed to me, 'that we (meaning, I supposed, the Kentucky Delegation) had distinctly ascertained that if Mr. Adams were elected President Mr. Clay would be appointed his Secretary of State; and that if Gen. Jackson were elected President, Mr. Clay would not.'"

Jesse Summers, in a Letter to Gen. Allen, of the Kentucky Senate, dated Feb. 5, 1828, says:

"I have heard Mr. David Trimble say, it was ascertained that if John Q. Adams was elected President he would appoint Henry Clay Secretary of State; and he also stated, in all probability if General Jackson was elected, he would not. At the same time Mr. Trimble stated, that the Representatives from this State, or a majority of them, thought that it would be better for us to have John Q. Adams President and Henry Clay Secretary of State, than to have General Jackson President and some other person Secretary."

The following statement of twelve citizens of Lewis county, Kentucky, was subscribed and sworn to on the 2d day of November, 1827, viz.:

"We, the subscribers, certify on oath, that we were severally present at the Lewis county court, for October, 1825, and heard David Trimble make a speech, and he used the following language:

'When we went on last fall to the city of Washington, we found Mr. Crawford out of the question: the contest was between General Jackson and John Quincy Adams. We ascertained that under no circumstances would General Jackson appoint our friend, Henry Clay, Secretary of State; we ascertained that Mr. Adams would appoint our friend, Henry Clay, Secretary of State. Knowing this, then, fellow-citizens, that General Jackson would not, and Mr. Adams would, appoint our friend, Henry Clay, Secretary of State, if you expected me to vote for General Jackson, you expected me to do that which I could not and would not do.'

Signed, *Jacob Frizzle, Jesse Hamrick,*
Henry Halbert, John Griffith,
David C. Heath, William Davis,
William Coffrin, Hezekiah Griffith,
Richard Pell, Wm. Hamblin,
John Hendrick, David Tonkry."

There are further proofs of Mr. Trimble's excuse; but it is needless to quote them.

HON. THOMAS METCALFE'S EXCUSE.

Among the evidence taken before the Senate of Kentucky is the following, viz.:

John S. Hitt, of Bourbon, stated that in 1825, on the 4th or 5th of January, he went into Washington city in the evening, and was in company with General Metcalfe, and asked him for information relative to the Presidential election. He said he knew little more than when he first arrived, or than witness; that the friends of Jackson would come to us and say—We hear you are going to vote for Mr. Adams; and the friends of Adams would come to us and say—We understand you are going to vote for Jackson; and so of the friends of Mr. Crawford. That we stand uncommitted, and we must know something about how the Cabinet is to be filled."

The following is extracted from a statement of John Desha, dated Nov. 17, 1827, viz.:

"After the common salutation took place, I said, 'Well, General, you have made us a President.'

He answered, 'Yes.'

'Do you think the people of Kentucky will be pleased with your vote?'

'I think they will when they hear my reasons.'

'What are your reasons, sir?'

'Why, we could not possibly get Mr. Clay in the Cabinet without voting for and electing Mr. Adams; and we could not do without Mr. Clay's talents.'

Mr. WHITE (Mr. B. yielding the floor) asked if Mr. Clay's district, from that day to this, had elected any other Representative than an anti Jackson man?

Mr. BOYD replied, he thought not. He held that every gentleman should represent first the views of his own constituents;

but there could be no doubt that Mr. Clay's district was then for Gen. Jackson for the Presidency, over Mr. Adams.

Mr. WHITE made some remark dissenting from this opinion.

MR. CLAY'S CONFESSION—HIS OWN AGENCY IN CONTROLLING THE EVENT.

Among the Kentucky members of Congress who voted for Mr. Adams was the Hon. David White, who represented the Frankfort District. Mr. White, as well as a vast majority of his constituents, was in favor of Gen. Jackson against Mr. Adams. From many leading men among his constituents he received letters shortly before the election, informing him, in substance, that they would be better satisfied with Mr. Adams President and Mr. Clay Secretary of State, in view of his further advancement, than with Gen. Jackson President, without any provision for Mr. Clay. As specimens of these letters, I submit a couple of extracts, which were published in 1828.

EXTRACT of a Letter from the Hon. J. J. Crittenden, now of the United States Senate, to the Hon. David White, dated Frankfort, Jan. 19, 1825.

"Thinking as I do of Mr. Clay—of his great integrity, his lofty American spirit, and his consummate ability—I believe it to be highly important to the public interest that he should occupy a distinguished station in the Executive Department. Under all present circumstances, my first wish in regard to this subject (and it is one dictated both by my personal partialities and considerations of the public good) would be, that Jackson should be the President, and Clay his Secretary of State; and I really do believe that the common good is more concerned in Clay's being Secretary, than it is in the question whether Jackson or Adams should be the President."

EXTRACT of a Letter from F. P. Blair, Esq. to the Hon. David White, dated Frankfort, Jan. 19, 1825.

Mr. Blair, after commenting on the resolutions of the Legislature, says:

"But notwithstanding the adverse circumstance that Mr. Clay was identified with the minority, which, with the judge-breakers, (of whom I can speak freely, being one myself,) was considered in the fervor of roused feeling as almost being an enemy; yet, if it had been certain that his future prospects for the Presidency would be materially affected by it, I do not believe that the vote on the resolutions would have passed. Or if it had been thought that Adams would be elected, and if elected would give Mr. Clay the highest place in his Cabinet, there is scarcely a doubt but that the vote would have been in favor of Adams. But

the vote was taken under very different suppositions.

"For my own part, I have no hesitation in saying, that although Jackson is personally preferred to Adams by the people, (an inclination I feel in common with them,) yet, if it were known that Jackson would give such direction to the course of his Administration, by his appointments or otherwise, as to foster Adams' future views in preference to Clay's, there would be but one sentiment among the supporters of the latter in Kentucky. They would consider it as a desertion of the true Western interests, which they feel vitally connected with the great principles advocated by Mr. Clay, and which they conceive in a great measure depend for their consummation upon the success of his future exertions. If, therefore, it should be perceived that the tendency of General Jackson's measures, as President, would be to supplant Mr. Clay by promoting the views of Adams, then I have no doubt that the voice of all those who are in favor of Mr. Clay would be, 'If we are doomed to have Mr. Adams as President at some time, let us have him now; if he has Gen. Jackson's preference, let the General himself make way for him. We would rather have him now, at the expense of Jackson, than hereafter, at the expense of Clay. But if Jackson gives earnest that he will throw his weight into the Western scale, then let us throw our weight into his.' This, I believe, would be the decision of three-fourths of the people of Kentucky."

By these and many other letters of similar import, Mr. White was induced to vote for Mr. Adams, believing that he was complying with the wishes of his constituents. In a Letter to the Editor of the *Argus*, dated June 27th, 1828, Mr. White himself uses the following language, viz.:

"These letters, with many others of a like import, and on the same subject, were received by me between the last of January and the 5th of February, 1825. My correspondents were numerous, and from the coincidence of their views and sentiments, I had reason to believe that it would be most agreeable to my constituents, and strictly consistent with the wishes of a majority of them, to adopt the course which I did finally pursue. That such communications, voluntarily made, from highly respectable and intelligent gentlemen, differing on local politics, and leaders of parties at that time, on a subject of such deep interest and pressing emergency as that of the election of a Chief Magistrate, should have a powerful influence on my mind, is perfectly natural. That I was confirmed in my vote by their suggestions, I do freely acknowledge; and, therefore, as I have often heretofore frankly avowed, I now state, that I voted for Mr. Adams with a view to promote Mr. Clay's future prospects for the Presidency."

How these Letters came to be written was a subject of inquiry and investigation in Kentucky during the Presidential canvass of 1828.

Mr. Amos Kendall, then Editor of the *Western Argus*, stated in his paper, and

on oath before the Senate of Kentucky, that as an inducement to him to write to Mr. White, he was informed by Mr. F. P. Blair, three or four weeks before the Presidential election; that if Mr. Adams were elected he would make Mr. Clay Secretary of State.

"J. Dudley, Esq. a Senator from Franklin and Owen counties, being called upon, made the following statement on the floor of the Senate: One day in January, 1825, F. P. Blair came into the Senate Chamber, seated himself near me, and inquired my opinion on the resolutions passed, requesting our members of Congress to vote for General Jackson as President of the United States. Mr. B. desired that I would write letters, requesting the members, and particularly D. White, from this district, to consult with Mr. Clay, and vote as he might desire. To this I objected, and gave my reasons therefor. Mr. B. appeared surprised that I should raise any objections, particularly as I was opposed to the resolutions. He said that a number of members of both Houses who voted for the resolution, had written such letters, and that I could do it with more propriety. He said, if Mr. White could be induced to vote for Mr. Adams, he would obtain the vote of Kentucky, and with it the votes of most of the Western States, which would elect him; in which case Mr. Clay would obtain the appointment of Secretary of State. I then inquired how that fact had been ascertained. His answer was, that letters had been received from gentlemen of undoubted veracity, at Washington city, containing such information, and I might rely with confidence on that statement."

Mr. Blair, when called on by the Senate of Kentucky, as a witness, to state how he got the information which he had communicated to Messrs. Kendall and Dudley, refused to be sworn or to testify; but concluded an explanation he made to the Senate in the following manner, viz.:

"He had not communicated to any one the grounds on which he had made his statement to Mr. Kendall, nor had he shown the letters to which the gentleman alluded to any person to whom they were not addressed."

Mr. Crittenden had publicly denied that he had received letters from Washington, of the character in question, and upon Mr. Blair the public attention was fixed as the channel through which the information had come from Mr. Clay, or some one else at Washington. Mr. Clay was called upon to remove the injunction of secrecy, and let his letters to Mr. Blair come before the public. Feeling the injurious inferences every where drawn from the position in which Mr. Clay had been placed by the investigation into which his friends in the Senate of Kentucky, had been induced to enter, J. Harvie, the Chairman

of the Adams' Committee at Frankfort, Kentucky, on the 14th April, 1828, addressed a Letter to Mr. Clay, in which he requested for publication copies of his correspondence both with Mr. Blair and Mr. Kendall. Mr. Clay's reply must have been well considered; for it was not written until the 5th of June following. He admitted the existence of a correspondence with Mr. Blair on the subject of the Presidential election; but after giving some reasons, or rather excuses, for his course, comes to the following conclusion, viz.:

"I must decline, therefore, authorising the publication of our correspondence. But the Central Committee is at liberty to exhibit to the inspection of any gentleman, of any party, all such portions of it as relate to the late Pre-idential election, and I will do the same upon any such application being made to me."

On application to the committee, however, it was found that they had no copy to show; nor had Mr. Clay taken any step to furnish them. The sensation produced by a knowledge of this fact, compelled the committee to apply to Mr. Blair for copies, without Mr. Clay's order, and copies were furnished. The following is Mr. Kendall's account of them, given at the time, in a Letter addressed to Mr. Clay, through the columns of the *Argus*, viz.:

At last these famous copies are accessible. *I have seen them.* The one is dated January 8th, 1825—an ominous day; the other, January 29th. The former only is of material importance. It is perhaps unfortunate for you that it is not accompanied by those letters from Mr. Blair, 'showing in what sense he understood them,' to which you allude; for I aver, that no candid man can read it without a perfect conviction that the vote of Kentucky was given to Mr. Adams for the purpose of promoting your personal aggrandizement. Indeed, it is impossible for me to conceive how any other construction can be put upon the letter, than that the friends of Mr. Adams had promised you the first office in his gift, with their future support; that your friends had determined to vote for Mr. Adams on that account; and that you were using personal exertions to bring the members of Congress into your views.

Not wishing to expose myself to the slightest imputation of misrepresenting the contents of your letters, I determined to make no remarks on that of the 29th January, and wrote to the chairman of the Administration Committee the following note:

'FRANKFORT, July 2, 1828.

Sir: I intend to use certain parts of Mr. Clay's letter to Mr. Blair, dated 8th of January, 1825, in my reply to the attack made on me by that gentleman through your committee; and I deem it more proper, and more just to him, that it should be published entire, with all the views which it

contains, than that the public should have only my recollections of some of its most prominent passages. Presuming that your committee will feel at liberty to adopt a step which can only tend to guard Mr. Clay against misconceptions and misrepresentations, I have to request that you will furnish me with a copy of that letter. This request is confined to the letter of the 8th January, 1825, in which I do not perceive any expression not decorous towards the public. An answer on this day, or early to-morrow morning, is solicited.

'Yours, &c. AMOS KENDALL.'

The chairman received the note with that suavity and politeness for which he is so justly distinguished, kindly remarking to my friend who bore it, that *if the letters had been left in his possession I should not have had a sight of them, much less a copy*; but he finally promised to lay the application before the committee at their next meeting. As I cannot, from the feelings evinced by the chairman, expect any thing favorable from the deliberations of the committee, I feel compelled to resort to my recollections for the substance of your letter to Mr. Blair.

Let the date be recollected—it is January 8th, 1825. You commence by giving Mr. Blair your opinion upon a work by Lord Byron, which you say you have sent him—(*franked, I presume*) You then enter into the subject of the Presidential election, and say, that the time has now arrived when you must begin to think seriously for whom you are to vote. You state that the friends of all the candidates entertained the opinion that on you rested the decision of the contest, and that your situation was singular and amusing. You say that the friends of the several candidates accost you in turn; that a friend of General Jackson says to you, 'My dear sir, my hopes are upon you—do not disappoint us; our partiality was for you next to the hero; you know the anxiety we all had for a Western President.' That a friend of Mr. Crawford comes and says: 'The hopes of the Republican Party are upon you: you and Mr. Crawford were the only Republican candidates: had you been returned to the House, we should all have concentrated our force upon you.' The language of Mr. Adams' friends you give in nearly the following words:

'A friend of Mr. Adams comes to me, *with tears in his eyes*, and says—Sir, Mr. Adams has always had the greatest respect for you, and the highest admiration for your talents. There is no station to which you are not equal. You were undoubtedly the second choice of New England; and I pray you to consider whether the public good and your own future interests do not distinctly point you to the course which you ought to pursue.'

You then give some reasons why Mr. Adams should be preferred to General Jackson, among which I remember only the statement, that the Ohio delegation had determined to vote for Mr. Adams, the alleged want of qualifications in the General and his military propensities. You then declare distinctly, and in nearly the following words—

'My friends entertain the belief that their kind wishes towards me will, in the end, be more likely to be accomplished by so bestowing their votes.'

You then declare, that you have urged them to be governed by their views of the public good

alone, and aver that you have been influenced only by that consideration. In conclusion, you use nearly the following words:

‘Your Representative is inclined to concur with us in these sentiments; and as I know his respect for your opinion, I request, if you concur in our views, that you will write to him by return mail to strengthen him in his inclinations. Show this to Crittenden alone.’ ”

This statement as to the contents of that Letter went the rounds of the Jackson papers through the whole Union in 1828, and its accuracy was never denied. I am informed that the passages marked as quoted are nearly, if not precisely, literal extracts from the Letter, having been obtained through several persons who successively called and read the Letter, with the concerted design of getting accurate extracts through their concurrent recollections. This Letter established the fact beyond controversy, that the “kind wishes” of Mr. Clay’s friends towards him, induced them to bestow their votes on Mr. Adams; and that he himself, well understanding their intention and its object, was directly instrumental in a secret movement to influence the vote of a hesitating colleague, through apparently spontaneous letters from his constituents. After that disclosure, few ventured to deny, in 1828, that the advancement of Mr. Clay was the controlling motive with him and his friends, in giving the Presidency to Mr. Adams.

My colleague, (*Mr. White*.) the other day, denied the charge of bargain, or understanding, in the Presidential election of 1825, and went on to say:

“This was too grave a charge to be made on such vague and uncertain grounds. Until that letter was produced, there was not, in his judgment, any evidence before the country that that letter had been written; and he now challenged his colleague, and he would be responsible for it, that if Mr. Clay was called on he would take off every shackle from the correspondence. And unless his colleague produced the letter, he said his allegation stood condemned before the American people and the civilized world.”

He further said:

‘That he had never heard of the letter till he saw the letter of his colleague. He had never seen it in his life. And he had only to say, in relation to it, that if there was any such letter, and his colleague would address a line to Mr. Clay he would throw off all the shackles, and disclose him all the correspondence.’ ”

But Mr. Clay and Mr. Blair are now in the city, and no doubt the Letter is still preserved. I propose to my colleague to

join me in a call on Mr. Clay for its publication. It is due to the country and to Mr. Clay himself, that all mystery shall be removed from this transaction. If he can show that such a Letter does not and never did exist, I will take all the pains in my power to retrieve his character from any imputations which its alleged contents have brought upon it.

Mr. B. asked the Clerk to read the form of a joint Letter to Mr. Clay which he invited his colleague to sign with himself, and it was read, as follows, viz.:

“HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

“April 28, 1844.

“SIR: The public notice having been called to a letter said to have been written by you at Washington city the 8th of January, 1825, addressed to Francis P. Blair, then a resident of Frankfort, Kentucky, touching the then pending Presidential election, in which it is charged you said to Mr. Blair, among other things, in substance as follows:

‘A friend of Mr. Adams comes to me with tears in his eyes, and says, Sir, Mr. Adams has always had the greatest respect for you, and the highest admiration for your talents. There is no station to which you are not equal. You were undoubtedly the second choice of New England, and I pray you to consider whether the public good and your own future interests do not distinctly point you to the course which you ought to pursue.’

‘My friends entertain the belief that their kind wishes towards me will, in the end, be more likely to be accomplished by so bestowing their votes. Your representative is inclined to concur with us in these sentiments; and as I know his respect for your opinions, I request, if you concur in our views, that you will write to him by return mail to strengthen him in his inclinations. Show this to Crittenden alone.’

“To avoid all misapprehension, therefore, and to the end that even-handed justice may be done to all, we respectfully ask to be informed whether such a letter ever existed, and if so, that you will furnish for publication (if within your reach) the original or a copy of said letter; or if not within your reach, that you will give full authority to Mr. Blair to publish said letter, or a certified copy of it.

“Respectfully your obedient servants,

“HON. H. CLAY.”

Mr. WHITE (Mr. B. yielding the floor) remarked to his colleague, that he could not enter into any such partnership. He could only say to his colleague—and he did it with the utmost confidence—that if he would address such a letter to Mr. Clay, he no doubt would frankly respond to him, and throw off every shackle upon the subject.

Mr. Boyd said, I choose to call on Mr. Clay and his friends in my place, as a representative of the people, to give an explanation as to this letter. I do not care to encounter the abuse I might receive from my distinguished fellow-Kentuckian if I should approach him on this subject in my private capacity, unless I should go under the shield of my colleague. But, in my public character, I do not hesitate to call on Mr. Clay and his friends to tear away the veil of mystery which hangs around this letter. That it existed, we have the admission of Mr. Clay himself, in his refusal to let it be published in 1828; of its substance, and a portion of its language, we have a statement which has remained over fifteen years uncontradicted and unexplained. If there be any thing wrong about it—any misrepresentation or misconception—let us have the letter; let the world judge for itself, and let ample justice be done to Mr. Clay, as well as to those who are accused of bringing false charges against him.

His colleague had asked the other day, how he, Mr. Boyd, could advert to the evidence in this case without a blush; and now, said Mr. B., if blushes rise on reading such testimony, they will be on other cheeks than mine.

Mr. WURRE said he did not intend the remark for his colleague.

Mr. BOYD said, Sir, although impartial men may believe, as I do myself, that there was no technical bargain entered into between Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay; in their own proper persons, yet it does seem to me, that no one free from prejudice can carefully examine the circumstances and evidence in the case without the most thorough conviction that it was understood by the parties that Mr. Clay's appointment to the office of Secretary of State would result from the election of Mr. Adams to the Presidency; that the vote of Kentucky was cast for Mr. Adams with that view, and for the further object of promoting Mr. Clay's prospects for the Presidency, in utter disregard of the will of that State. And in this, the most favorable view of the transaction, it merited the condemnation it has received at the hands of the American people.

Mr. BOYD said his colleague had introduced in evidence Mr. Clay's own declarations to Gen. Lafayette and others, as

well as the opinions of the editor of the Richmond Enquirer and others, to prove his innocence. His own declarations were met at the time by proof of counter declarations, and the opinions quoted were expressed while their authors were ignorant of a large portion of the evidence afterwards elicited. He had not done Mr. Ritchie the justice to state that, after the expressions quoted by him were used, he, Mr. R., on the disclosure of further evidence, publicly recanted his first opinion.

Mr. WHITE (Mr. B. yielding) said his colleague, in every statement he had professed to give, had stated it fairly, as far as he had gone, but he had omitted much of the testimony. With reference to the Richmond Enquirer, he would refer his colleague to the article in that paper of February, 1825, for his (Mr. W.'s) quotation, of which Mr. Ritchie complained, and he would find that he (Mr. W.) had taken every line, every syllable which had any just application to the matter.

Mr. BOYD said, as to that matter, he would turn his colleague over to Mr. Ritchie.

But if the opinions of men are to be taken as good evidence in favor of Mr. Clay they are equally good against him. What will my colleague make of the following?

"I assert," says Mr. McDuffie, of South Carolina, "and am willing to stake my humble stock of reputation upon the truth of the assertion, that the circumstances of the extraordinary coalition between Adams and Clay furnish as strong evidence of an abandonment of political principle on the part of Mr. Clay, and of a corrupt political bargain between him and Mr. Adams, as is ordinarily required to establish the guilt of those who are charged in a court of quarter sessions with the common crimes known to the law."

I could point to a distinguished member of Congress on this floor who is said also to have concurred in a strong expression of opinion on this subject.

Mr. WELLER inquired to whom the gentleman alluded.

Mr. BOYD replied, Mr. WILLOUGHBY NEWTON. The resolutions were as follows:

"Resolved, That we regard the evidence already before the public as amply sufficient to verify the charge of a corrupt understanding between John Q. Adams and Henry Clay, by which they were enabled to elevate each other to office, contrary to the strong indications of the wishes of the people."

Resolved, That we regard the example thus set, of exposing to auction the highest offices of State, as an indelible stain on the republican party of our country, and as marking the approach of that decay of public morals, which is the constant forerunner of the ruin of republics."

An address of the Central Jackson Committee for North Carolina, understood to be from the pen of *Geo. E. Badger*, Gen. Harrison's late Secretary of the Navy, was issued in 1828, which contains the following opinion as to the considerations upon which Mr. Adams was elected, viz :

"Thus, then, as we conceive, it sufficiently appears that Jackson, the man of the people, was, at the last election, defeated, not upon any considerations of comparative merit between Mr. Adams and himself, but in order that Mr. Clay might be Secretary of State, and heir apparent to the Presidency. And can it be seriously contended that you ought, or that you properly can, give your sanction to this apostacy from principle—your support to this ambitious project? Because Mr. Clay once forgot his duty and imposed upon the nation a President whom the nation did not desire, ought you to forget your interests and your rights, offer a reward to treachery, and thus set an example fatal to the fair and equal operation of our Constitution? To assert that you ought, seems little short of an insult to common sense."

On the title-page of this address, I find the names of the Jackson electoral ticket for 1828, among whom are Willie P. Mangum, now President of the Senate, E. B. Dudley, and other distinguished citizens of North Carolina.

In 1827 the Tennessee Legislature, with only two negatives in the Senate, and unanimously in the House of Representatives, adopted a preamble and resolutions which contain the following declarations, viz :

"Political hostility and personal estrangement had for several years, and on momentous subjects, separated himself and Mr. Clay. No approach to union, no inclination for amity, was manifested by either, until it was ascertained that, as long as they obeyed the principles and supported the opinions which had formed their respective pretensions and produced their avowed opposition, the power at which they grasped was not to be gained; that continued disunion would frustrate, and that instant combination would gratify their mutual ambition—then, and not till then, long-cherished distrust was mutually forgot-

ten; oft expressed opinions were practically renounced, and adverse principles openly abandoned. Each became the artificer of that man's promotion, whose depression, up to the moment, had been a chief object of his exertion. The highest amount of Executive power was divided, and the closest fraternity of political fortune was established between them. What is enormous need not be exaggerated; what is flagrant requires no demonstration. Mr. Adams desired the office of President; he went into the combination without it, and came out with it. Mr. Clay desired that of Secretary of State; he went into the combination without it and came out with it. Of this transaction the simplest history is the best analysis."

"The members of this General Assembly, therefore, in protesting against the election of Mr. Adams as impure and anti-republican, are sensible of no precipitancy of judgment, or too great license of language. Unwilling to assert what is doubtful, they are determined to speak what is true; nor do they deem it necessary to fortify their protest by the numerous collateral proofs to be derived, either from the contradictions contained in the studied vindication of the Secretary of State; from the confessions of his friend, his colleague, and his champion, or from the pertinent and concurring reminiscences of respectable witnesses."

Among those who voted in the affirmative I find the names of E. H. Foster, present Senator, R. Cheatham, E. Hurst, and J. A. Rogers.

I find also, that the Hon. John Bell, late Secretary of War, in a letter dated Sept. 17th, 1827, expressed the following opinions, viz :

"I have seen the highest and most important office in the Government filled by means and under circumstances affording all the evidences of a coalition formed upon the basis of mutual benefits to be received and conferred, independently of any controverted point in the details, that the public can ever expect the light of, in any combination that has been or may be entered into, to defeat the will of the people. Ambitious and aspiring politicians, who have great characters to sustain, and sense enough to guard against the common blunders of the less practised adepts in the arts of intrigue and management in forming coalitions, will but seldom expose themselves to the danger of detection from positive proof. It is not, therefore, in my view, of so much importance to consider, whether a possibility of innocence can be admitted in favor of the parties implicated, as to determine whether the presumption to the contrary is not so great in the present instance, that their continuance

n office would be incompatible with the safety and well-being of our political institutions."

These opinions, I believe without exception, were formed and expressed before the disclosure of Mr. Clay's letter to Mr. Blair, showing by what machinery, put in operation by Mr. Clay himself, the votes of members of Congress were controlled. After that event the people expressed *their* opinion at the polls. Of the electoral votes there were given—

For General Jackson 209.

For Mr. Adams 62.

Of the popular votes, there were given

For Gen. Jackson, about 643,096.

For Mr. Adams, about 507,412.

Thus was the coalition of Adams and Clay condemned by the country, chiefly on the ground that it was impure in its origin. Nor do I think their judgment will be reversed, unless it be by a new generation, who, like my colleague, have never seen the testimony.

Mr. B. then adverted to Mr. Clay's course on the bankrupt law. There never was, said he, a more glaring outrage on the will of constituents than Mr. Clay's refusal to vote for the repeal of that law at the session of 1841-2. Through the members of the House of Representatives, through the Legislature, through every practicable channel, the will of the people of Kentucky had come up to their Senators demanding their votes in favor of repeal. Mr. Clay not only refused to vote for the repeal, but denounced the act he was required to do as cruel and inhuman in the last degree, thus casting the severest censure on those who made the call on him and on his colleagues in both Houses of Congress, who had yielded a ready obedience. Prior to 1824 Mr. Clay held the doctrine that a representative was bound to carry out the will of his constituents, no matter how he came to a knowledge of that will; but in the Presidential election of that year, he violated his former principles, and turned his back upon Democracy, that he might be, as he ever since has been, locked in the embraces of Federalism.

Here the Speaker's mallet fell, indicating the termination of Mr. Boyd's hour.

NOTES.

1. The opponents of Mr. Adams' Administration, in Kentucky, or at least that

portion of them who had acquiesced in or promoted his election, did not at first charge as corrupt the understanding by which he was made President, and Mr. Clay Secretary of State. The character of the controversy was changed; however, by Mr. Clay's declarations in his Address to the Public, commenting on Gen. Jackson's Letter to Carter Beverly, dated Lexington, 26th June, 1827. To appreciate the grounds of that change, the following extracts from that Address should be read in connection with the foregoing evidence, particularly the quotations from Mr. Clay's Letter to Mr. Blair, viz.:

"I neither made, nor authorised, nor knew of, any proposition whatever to either of the three candidates who were returned to the House of Representatives at the last Presidential election, or to the friends of either of them, for the purpose of influencing the result of the election, or for any other purpose. And all allegations, intimations, and innuendoes, that my vote, on that occasion, was offered to be given, or was in fact given, in consideration of any stipulation or understanding, expressed or implied, direct or indirect, written or verbal, that I was, or that any other person was not, to be appointed Secretary of State, or that I was, in any other manner, to be personally benefited, are devoid of all truth, and destitute of any foundation whatever."

"It will be universally admitted, that the accusation is of the most serious nature. Hardly any more atrocious could be preferred against a Representative of the people in his official character. The charge in substance is, that deliberate "propositions of bargain" were made by my Congressional friends collectively, through an authorised and distinguished member of Congress, to Gen. Jackson; that their object was, by these 'means of bargain and corruption,' to exclude Mr. Adams from the Department of State, or to secure my promotion to office; and that I was privy, and assented to those propositions, and to the employment of those means. Such being the accusation and the prosecutor, and the issue between us, I have now a right to expect that he will substantiate his charges by the exhibition of satisfactory evidence. In that event, there is no punishment which would exceed the measure of my offence. In the opposite event, what ought to be the judgment of the American public, is cheerfully submitted to their wisdom and justice."

2. Some Whig Editor recently fabricated a statement, that Gen. Jackson, in a Letter to Gen. Hamilton, had acquitted Mr. Clay of the charge of bargain in the election of 1825, so extensively made and believed. It is fortunate for the cause of truth, that the venerable hero has lived to put his *reto* on this fabrication.

A CARD.

To the Editors of the Nashville Union.

GENTLEMEN: My attention has been called to various newspaper articles referring to a letter

said to have been written by me to Gen. Hamilton, recanting the charge of bargain made against Mr. Clay when he voted for Mr. Adams in 1825.

To put an end to all such rumors, I feel it to be due to myself to state, that I have no recollection of ever having written such a letter, and do not believe there is a letter from me to Gen. Hamilton, or any one else, that will bear such a construction. Of the charges brought against both Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay, at that time, I formed my opinion as the country at large did—from facts and circumstances that were indisputable and conclusive; and I may add that this opinion has undergone no change.

If Gen. Hamilton, or any one else, has a letter from me on this subject, which the friends of Mr.

Clay desire to make public, all that they have to do is to apply to him for it. As for myself, I have no secrets, and do not fear the publication of all that I have ever written on this or any other subject.

ANDREW JACKSON.

Hermitage, May 3, 1844. .

3. The Hon. Mr. Newton informs me, that he was one of two or three dissentients from the rest of the meeting who adopted the resolutions with which his name stands connected in the foregoing speech.

